



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,837	12/21/2004	Maaïke Wegman	NL020604	1261
24737 7590 10/10/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER PHONGSVIRAJATI, POONSIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3686				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/518,837

Applicant(s)

WEGMAN, MAAIKE

Examiner

SIND PHONGSVIRAJATI

Art Unit

3686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 7 recites the limitation "the indicated medical examination device" in line 3 of claim 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear to the examiner whether the claimed medical examination device was intended to be the medical care equipment or a claim element for a separate apparatus. For examination purposes, "the indicated medical examination device" will be considered as "the indicated medical care equipment".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. (5,966,310) in view of Bodor et al. (US 6,201,546).

3. As to **Claim 1**, Maeda teaches a method enabling a person to obtain information on equipment, the method comprising a first step of offering the person an option to indicate a selected equipment on a user interface, and a second step of transmitting, on receipt of an indication of the selected equipment, information relating to the indicated equipment to the user interface, characterized in that the method comprises: a step of offering the person an option to select a viewpoint (col. 10 line 5-8, col. 24 lines 8-27, Fig. 6-8); a further step of selecting, from a database comprising three-dimensional representations of equipment, a three-dimensional representation of the indicated equipment (col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line 13, col. 5 line 39 to col. 6 line 13); and a step of generating a two-dimensional view from a selected viewpoint of the selected three-dimensional representation (col. 10 line 5-8, col. 24 lines 8-27, Fig. 6-8). But Maeda does not specify the equipment as medical care equipment. Bodor does teach producing and storing three dimensional images of equipment that comprises medical devices and equipment (Bodor, Abstract, col. 17 lines 32-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the embodiments of retrieving equipment information to the user in the form of two and three-dimensional images to further include medical devices and equipment. One would have been motivated to further comprise medical devices and

equipment since the systems described by Maeda and Bodor are equally applicable to various apparatuses (Bodor, col. 17 lines 36-47).

4. As to **Claim 2**, Maeda teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the method comprises a step of offering an option to adjust the selected three-dimensional representation, representing a change in the configuration of the selected equipment (col. 4 line 57 to col. 5 line 8, col. 6 line 14-41).

5. As to **Claim 3**, Maeda teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the method comprises a step of offering an option to generate a sequence of two-dimensional views (col. 18 lines 1-28, col. 20 lines 1-45, Fig. 7-8).

6. As to **Claim 5**, Maeda does not specifically disclose a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the medical care equipment comprises a medical examination device. Bodor does teach wherein the medical care equipment comprises a medical examination device (Bodor, col. 17 lines 32-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the embodiments of retrieving equipment information to the user in the form of two and three-dimensional images to further include medical equipment further comprising devices for the same motivation as explained above in claim 1.

7. As to **Claim 6**, Maeda teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein a viewpoint may be selected from which a two-dimensional view of an inside area of a medical examination device is generated (Fig. 4D, 5C).

8. As to **Claim 8**, Maeda teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the first step is combined with offering the person the option to include information on facial characteristics of himself or herself with this indication, which information is included in the selected three-dimensional representation (col. 3 lines 7-9).

9. As to **Claim 9**, the combination of Maeda and Bodor teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the first step indication is used for the selection of a three-dimensional representation of the indicated medical care equipment. But Maeda and Bodor do not specifically disclose offering the person the option to include the name of a medical care location which is used for the selection of said medical care equipment. However, the ability to search for medical care equipment by the name of a medical care location is well known in the art, and official notice to that effect is hereby taken.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include adding a criteria to a search query in order to offer a person the option to include the name of a medical care location in order to narrow the search results in the selection of the indicated medical care equipment. One would have been motivated to offer a person the option to include the name of a medical care location so as to select the correct medical care equipment for three-dimensional representation at the desired medical care location.

10. As to **Claim 10**, Maeda teaches a system enabling a person to obtain information on equipment, comprising: a user interface comprising means for indicating a selected equipment on the user interface (col. 10 line 5-8, col. 24 lines 8-27, Fig. 6-8); and a

computer means for receiving an indication of the selected equipment from the user interface, and for transmitting, on receipt of said indication, information relating to the indicated equipment to the user interface, characterized in that the system comprises: means for selecting a viewpoint; a database comprising three-dimensional representations of equipment (col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line 13, col. 5 line 39 to col. 6 line 13); means for selecting, from said database, a three-dimensional representation based on the indication of the selected equipment; means for generating a two-dimensional view from a selected viewpoint of the selected three-dimensional representation (col. 10 line 5-8, col. 24 lines 8-27, Fig. 6-8). But Maeda does not specify the equipment as medical care equipment. Bodor does teach producing and storing three dimensional images of equipment that comprises medical devices and equipment (Bodor, Abstract, col. 17 lines 32-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the embodiments of retrieving equipment information to the user in the form of two and three-dimensional images to further include medical devices and equipment. One would have been motivated to further comprise medical devices and equipment since the systems described by Maeda and Bodor are equally applicable to various apparatuses (Bodor, col. 17 lines 36-47).

11. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. (5,966,310) in view of Bodor et al. (US 6,201,546) in further view of Levy (US 6,731,324).

12. As to **Claims 4 and 7**, the combination of Maeda and Bodor does not specifically disclose the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the information comprises audible information relating to the indicated medical care equipment and wherein the audible information comprises operating sound of the indicated medical examination device. Levy does teach the information comprising audible information relating to the indicated medical care equipment and wherein the audible information comprises operating sound of the indicated medical examination device (Levy, Abstract, col. 3 lines 14-19, col. 5 lines 26-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the feature of sound recognition of a medical device or equipment as taught by Levy within the teachings of Maeda and Bodor. One would have been motivated to include audio information to assist in such services as troubleshooting, instrument installation assistance, technique monitoring and training, and technical training (Levy, col. 2 lines 1-6).

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIND PHONGSVIRAJATI whose telephone number is (571) 270-5398. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00am-5:00pm (ET).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry O'Connor can be reached on (571) 272-6787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571) 272-1000.

/S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 3686
04 October 2008

/Gerald J. O'Connor/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3686